Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
09/805,362	KOO, CHAN-KYU	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Jeffrey R. Swearingen	2145	

	Jeffrey R. Swearingen	2145		
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the d	orrespondence address		
THE REPLY FILED <u>20 December 2007</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.				
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appelor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 Coperiods:	the same day as filing a Notice of A replies: (1) an amendment, affidavited al (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abandonme , or other evidence, which pla with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a R	aces the lequest	
a) $\stackrel{.}{\boxtimes}$ The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.			
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this An no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(ft)	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b), ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE).	date of the final rejection. FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WIT	HIN TWO	
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount on hortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date	of the fee. The appropriate extendally set in the final Office action;	sion fee or (2) as	
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi AMENDMENTS 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the appea		
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b	out prior to the date of filing a brief	will not be entered because		
(a) They raise new issues that would require further cor	nsideration and/or search (see NOT w);	E below);	_	
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in beti	er form for appeal by materially rec	lucing or simplifying the issue	s for	
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a converse NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding number of finally reje	cted claims.		
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment (PTOL-3	24).	
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		,	•	
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).				
7. Tor purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		be entered and an explanation	on of	
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected:				
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:				
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE				
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 				
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se	l and/or appellant fails to prove 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).		
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER		•		
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.	,	condition for allowance beca	use:	
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (13. ☐ Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)			
/Jason D Cardone/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2145				

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments are not persuasive.

Applicant was given allowable subject matter in the prior rejection.

The rejection remains over Curry. The rejection is not Curry in view of Stevens. Stevens is introduced as a reference to show an inherent feature within Curry. This is allowable under MPEP 2112, which deals with using extrinsic evidence - Stevens - to illustrate an inherent feature of the prior art - Curry.

Applicant failed to explicitly claim Applicant's argued feature - which is that two terminals may have the same IP address but different ports. Applicant's claim language does not teach an IP address is assigned to terminals A and B, with terminal A assigned a port number which is separate and different from a port number assigned to terminal B. For example in claim 1, no language exists stating that when the IP addresses are assigned to terminals, that one IP address is used for multiple terminals. Rather, an ID and port number are assigned to terminals that share one IP address. If no terminals exist that share one IP address, no ports are needed to be assigned.

The transmission of port numbers is inherent to the TCP/IP protocol, as is the use of port numbers.

All of Applicant's arguments are based upon this alleged deficiency of Curry - a lack of port numbers - which is an inherent characteristic of TCP/IP.